

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1 and 2; the drawings each have been amended to include a "Prior Art" legend.

Attachment: Submittal of Drawing Replacement Sheets (2)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Examiner Objection – Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 8, 2004, as failing to comply with C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2). A supplemental IDS was filed on June 7, 2006 in which a copy of the non-patent literature publication was included. Another copy of the non-patent literature publication that was listed on the IDS is enclosed herewith.

2.) Examiner Objection – Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figures 1 and 2 as requiring a "Prior Art" legend. A correction to the drawings is shown on the enclosed sheets (2). The Examiner's approval of the drawing change is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 21, 23-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beven (US 6,167,036) and further in view of 3GPP Specification TS 25.305 v5.4.0 and Rangarajan, *et al.* (US 6,757,544). The Applicant traverses the rejections.

The Examiner acknowledges that Beven fails to teach methods relating to handover wherein a "cell [is] identifiable by means of a cell Geographical Area Information (GAI)." To overcome the deficiencies of Beven, the Examiner looks to 3GPP TS 25.305 v5.4.0, which describes basic methods for locating a mobile in a cell, and to Rangarajan (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,544), which describes determining a user's position based on cell ID and sector. Neither of those references, however, teach or suggest methods related to a handover procedure that is a function of a cell GAI transmitted from a second radio network controlling unit that controls the resources of a radio base station to a first radio network controlling unit that controls the connection of the radio base station to a mobile station. The Examiner provides no rationale for combining the references, much less showing how such combination would result in the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of

obviousness of claims 21 and 29. Whereas claims 22-28 are dependent from claim 21, and include the limitations thereof, the Examiner has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of those claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all objections/rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 21-29.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: September 11, 2006

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com